



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/750,592	12/28/2000	Bhupal Kanaiyalal Dharia	SPECT-01041US0 DEL	6761
43813	7590	03/16/2007		
WINDY STRICKLAND 2012 BOB WHITE CT MARY ESTHER, FL 32569			EXAMINER RAMPURIA, SHARAD K	
			ART UNIT 2617	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 03/16/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No. 09/750,592	Applicant(s) DHARIA ET AL.	
Examiner Sharad Rampuria	Art Unit 2617	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 26 February 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).


4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
Please see appended folio.  
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

  
GEORGE ENG  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

***Response to Remarks***

Applicant's arguments filed on 02/26/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

***Relating to Claim 1:***

In comeback to Applicant's allegation that Howard et al. doesn't teach, "Control means to dynamically select said preferred ones of said transceiver stations to provide said particular dedicated channels for said particular mobile station separately from one of said transceiver stations providing particular broadcast channels for said particular mobile station." It is noted that the Examiner respectfully emphasize that the cited art, is legally efficient for the purpose of rendering claim unpatentable. In particular, Howard supports the declaration as, each of the broadcasters depend on different broadcast ranges for channels and may be varied on command from a zone manager. In a similar manner, each user has variable transmission and hence the "user zone" is the area reached by the user broadcasting at different ranges at different times. (Please perceive Col.14; 64-Col.15; 8 of Howard et al.), at the same time as in support; the claim is interpreted in comparable way as Applicant is, described the invention, in the specification, for ex. "In the wireless mobile network 111 of FIG. 1, when a connection to a BTS is setup for MS, the BSC selects the BTS that has the best radio access to the MS as host BTS. This setup process includes a series of signal transmissions back and forth between the BSC, the BTSs, and the MS using up-link and down-link radio control channels, and results in the assignment of dedicated radio traffic and control channels for the up-link and down-link between the MS and the BTS. Once this connection is set-up, user traffic is transmitted between the MS and the BSC. While

Art Unit: 2617

the connection lasts, the BTS/BSC controls the operation of the radio traffic channels, including power control, frequency hopping, and timing advance on dedicated control channels, while it continues to use the radio broadcast channel for operation, maintenance and signaling with all the other MSs in the cell.” [For instance, ¶ 0037 of Dharia et al.]. Therefore, Howard teaches the selection of particular channel for a mobile station, which is different from the broadcasting to the entire group. Hence, it is believed that Howard et al. *still teaches the claimed limitations*.

The above arguments also recites for the claims 50, 57, 65, 74, 85, 92, consequently the response is the same explanation as set forth above with regard to claim 1.

Because the remaining claims depend directly/indirectly, from one of the independent claims discussed above, consequently the response is the same explanation as set forth above.

With the intention of that explanation, it is believed and as enlighten above, the refutation are sustained.

*Sharad Rampuria*  
Sharad Rampuria  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2617